R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 639 EF 001 283

PLANNING AND OPERATING COLLEGE UNION BUILDINGS.

BY- BUTTS, PORTER

ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE UNIONS, ITHACA, N.Y.

PUB DATE OCT 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.84 44P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION, *STUDENT UNIONS, *FINANCIAL POLICY, *OBJECTIVES, *PLANNING, *FACILITY GUIDELINES, SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS, FINANCIAL SUPPORT,

THIS MONOGRAPH IS A DISCUSSION OF FOUR ASPECTS OF STUDENT UNIONS. PART ONE DISCUSSES THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF A UNION AND THE UNION AS A CAMPUS CENTER. PART TWO DEALS WITH THE PLANNING OF UNION BUILDINGS AND GIVES PROCEDURES, PRINCIPLES AND CAUTIONS. UNION FACILITIES AND SERVICES ARE LISTED. PART THREE DISCUSSES THE ORGANIZATION AND ACTIVITIES OF A UNION IN THE AREAS OF STAFF, MANAGEMENT, RELATIONS TO THE COLLEGE, TO EDUCATION'S PROGRAMS, TO STUDENT AFFAIRS, TO THE EDUCATION FUNCTION AND TO THE BUSINESS OFFICE. PART FOUR DISCUSSES THE FINANCIAL POLICIES RELATIVE TO FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION, PAYMENT OF DEBT, STUDENT FEES, REPAIRS, UTILITIES, PROGRAM FUNDS, STAFF BENEFITS, PROFITS AND DISPOSITION OF OPERATING BALANCE. COPIES ARE ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE CENTRAL OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE UNIONS, WILLARD STRAIGHT HALL, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, N.Y., 14850 FOR $2.00. (HH)

Planning And Operating College Union Buildings

Planning and Operating College Union Buildings

Published by
The Association of College Unions — International

Prepared by Porter Butts, Editor of Publications, with the assistance of the Executive Committee of the Association

Additional copies of this manual may be obtained at $2.00

FIRST EDITION—APRIL, 1948
SECOND EDITION (REVISED)—FEBRUARY, 1952
THIRD EDITION (REVISED)—FEBRUARY, 1954
FOURTH EDITION (REVISED)—OCTOBER, 1957
FIFTH EDITION (REVISED)—OCTOBER, 1960
SIXTH EDITION (REVISED)—JANUARY, 1965
SEVENTH EDITION (REVISED)—OCTOBER, 1967

Other publications of the Association, available by writing the Central Office of the Association of College Unions, Willard Straight Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. 14850

"Standards for Professional Staff Preparation and Compensation in College Union Work." (16 pp.). $2.

Proceedings of past international conferences, $4.

"Bulletin" (five issues per year). $2; 50c for individual copies

Catalogue of the Association's 50th Anniversary Art Exhibition (40 pp., illustrated). $2.50

"College Unions—Fifty Facts." (12 pp. pamphlet outlining general information concerning unions). 10c

"The College Union Story," by Porter Butts. (8 pp. reprint from the Journal of the American Institute of Architects). 50c

Course in College Union Operations (30 mimeograph papers at 50c and $1. Write to Wisconsin Union, Madison, Wis., 53706, for list)

"Directory of the Association of College Unions." (73 pp.). $2 (non-members $5.)

"Planning a College Union Building," by Chester A. Berry. (Graduate degree thesis). $4.75.

"A Union Credo," by Earl E. Harper. (14 pp. reprint of a regional conference address). 10c

"College Unions—Year 50", including a history of the Association of College Unions by Harold E. Pride and the catalogue of the Association's 50th anniversary art exhibition. (198 pp., illustrated). $5.

"Administration and Operation of the College Union," by Boris Bell. (152 pp.). $2.50.

"Art in the Union," by Norman Moore. (34 pp.). $1.

"The College Union Outdoors," by Theodore Crabb. (28 pp.). $1.

"Planning for a College Union," by Frank Noffke. (34 pp.). $1.

"The Union Recreation Games Area," by George F. Stevens. $1.

"Food Service and the College Union," by Douglas C. Osterheld. (35 pp.). $1.

"Planning College Union Facilities for Multiple-Use," by Porter Butts. (112 pp., illustrated). $3.

"State of the College Union Around the World," by Porter Butts. (352 pp., illustrated). $8.50.

"These Are Our Best." (A compilation of union programs considered particularly successful). (252 pp.). $2.

"Annotated Bibliography of College Union Literature, 1950-1967," by Ernest Christensen. $4.

CONTENTS

PREFACE

As with other college divisions, the policies and practices in the operation of unions are not uniform. Also, in the most recent general survey (1963), about 40% of the responding unions were less than five years old, and thus had not had opportunity to establish themselves firmly or to report on the basis of extensive or well developed policy. In the following sections of this manual, where there is considerable diversity of approach, a few representative practices are given. But, where surveys or studies of the Association of College Unions have shown a preferred practice or noticeable trend, the Association's findings are indicated.

There is now a considerable literature on union planning, organization, operation, and programming—in terms of conference papers dating back to 1922, graduate theses, special surveys, magazine articles, and the Association's own printed publications—plus an extensive annotated bibliography. Many of these publications can be obtained, in original form or on microfilm, by writing to the Association central office, or consulted (on microfilm) at the following libraries which serve as regional depositories for Association materials:

University of Connecticut Union, Storrs, Conn.
Teachers College Library, Columbia University, N. Y.
University of Maryland Library, College Park, Md.
University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, N.C.
University of Cincinnati Library, Cincinnati, Ohio
University of Illinois Library, Urbana, Ill.
University of Minnesota Library, Minneapolis, Minn.
University of Kansas Library, Lawrence, Kan.
Oklahoma State University Library, Stillwater, Okla.
University of Arizona Library, Tucson, Ariz.
University of Oregon Library, Eugene, Ore.

1. THE NATURE AND THE PURPOSES OF A UNION

The following is a statement of union purpose unanimously adopted by the Association general membership in 1956:

"**1.** The union is the community center of the college, for all the members of the college family—students, faculty, administration, alumni, and guests. It is not just a building; it is also an organization and a program. Together they represent a well-considered plan for the community life of the college.

"**2.** As the 'living room' or the 'hearthstone' of the college, the union provides for the services, conveniences, and amenities the members of the college family need in their daily life on the campus and for getting to know and understand one another through informal association outside the classroom.

"**3.** The union is part of the educational program of the college.

"As the center of college community life, it serves as a laboratory of citizenship, training students in social responsibility and for leadership in a democratic society.

"Through its various boards, committees, and staff, it provides a cultural, social, and recreational program, aiming to make free time activity a cooperative factor with study in education.

"In all its processes it encourages self-directed activity, giving maximum oportunity for self-realization and for growth in individual social competency and group effectiveness. Its goal is the development of persons as well as intellects.

"**4.** The union serves as a unifying force in the life of the college, cultivating enduring regard for and loyalty to the college."

Other Statements of Union Purpose

Representative statements of union objectives, in union constitutions and by those who have studied unions intensively, are:

1. "To provide a common life and a cultivated social program for the students, faculty, and alumni of the university."

2. "To serve as an informal education medium for supplementing the academic education of students and, insofar as possible, for relating the academic and non-academic factors of education—that the student's total training and experience may be well-rounded and complete."

3. "To carry out the meaning implied by the word 'union' or 'com-

munity center' by centralizing, integrating, and democratizing university community effort and activity."

4. "To contribute to the student's education for self-government and civic responsibility."
5. "To give students the opportunity, through cooperative effort and self-government (in determining union operating and program policies), to affect many of th costs of going to college."
6. "To gather into a true society the teacher and student."
7. "To make the large university a more human place."
8. "To create an instrument for the illumination and enhancement of personal, and social living."
9. "To provide a living room which converts the university from a 'house' of learning into a 'home' of learning."
10. "To help students formulate intelligent and practical programs of action in carrying forward the task of creating a better society."

The Original Nature of the Union

The earliest college unions were student debating societies in English universities. The first, founded at Cambridge in 1815, was literally a "union" of three debating societies. It was followed by a sister organization at Oxford in 1823. For years there had been debating societies within the individual colleges of the universities, but now students sought a university-wide society and "unity through the understanding of differences," cutting across college lines. In the beginning the Cambridge Union headquartered in a dingy back room of the Red Lion Inn and the United Debating Society at Oxford in a "low-browed" room at Christ Church College. At first the new unions met with the active disapproval of university authorities, on the basis that debating occupied time that students should be studying. Deprived of university facilities, the unions worked to obtain their own debating hall, committee rooms for conferences among debaters, a reading room, and a place where those arriving early for a debate could have their evening meal. Such quarters were rented. It was not until 1857 that the Oxford Union built its own building.

Thus, the emphasis in the British unions was, and in the case of the older unions still is, on debate and discussion, on independence of student thought and action. The Oxford and Cambridge Unions over the years have played such an important part in the discussion of national political and social issues, and in training students to take part in public life, that they have come to be known as the "cradle of the British Parliament."

But the British unions did not remain debate centers only. Gradually,

reference libraries, dining rooms, meeting rooms, lounges, billiard rooms, and offices were added. The buildings took on the character of men's clubs—the British "gentlemen's club," with a bar. And they emphasized good paintings as part of the decoration, books of poetry and philosophy in the libraries. Dante Gabriel Rosetti, William Morris, and other Pre-Raphaelites decorated the Oxford Union walls with frescoes; a gift of the Prince of Wales of one hundred pounds was spent for books; Browning donated an autographed set of his poems and plays. So unions came to be known also as centers of fellowship and good taste.

They became, in fact, a symbol of the traditional British two-fold goal in education: to promote the art of living, and especially of living together—of civilized behavior as well as knowledge—and to infuse students with the idea that they are responsible for the welfare of their country.

American colleges at the turn of the century saw in the British unions an element needed in American education.

The first "union" in America had been founded at Harvard in 1830—also a student debate society fashioned in its objectives after the original Oxford Union. But by the time Harvard students and alumni undertook to plan a building of their own (1893), the union conception embraced the idea of a general club (for men, and privately owned)—"a large and comprehensive club, which shall do for Harvard what the unions of Oxford and Cambridge have done for these universities." The Historical Committee of the Harvard Union added, in 1897, "We chose the name Union in the hope that out of the Debating Society a large general society, like the unions at Cambridge and Oxford, would grow." The new emphasis on the social elements of student life appeared in the dedication address (1901)—"the need . . . for meeting each other, for meeting your teachers, and for meeting the older graduates"—and also in the Union constitution adopted the same year: "its object shall be to promote comradeship among members of Harvard University, by providing a suitable club house for social purposes."

The first union building (Houston Hall) to be planned and administered by a university itself was built in 1896 by the University of Pennsylvania. Again, this was not a debate club, but rather "a place where all may meet on common ground." The Hall provided reading and writing rooms, dining rooms, billiards, committee rooms, student offices, photo darkrooms, and an auditorium.

This new idea of a general university social center shortly spread to other campuses.

"If one were to name the most fundamental characteristic of these English institutions (Oxford and Cambridge)," Wisconsin's President Van Hise said at his inaugural in 1904, "it would be the system of halls of residence and

unions. The communal life of instructors and students in work, in play, and in social relations is the very essence of the spirit of Oxford and Cambridge. If Wisconsin is to do for the sons of the state what Oxford and Cambridge are doing for the sons of England, not only in producing scholars but in making men, it must have halls of residence and to these there must be added a union."

It was a time of expanding campus populations when the social agencies which once seemed to humanize, enrich, and unify college life—the chapel, the convocation, the boarding house, the informal and spontaneous gatherings of teachers and students—became inadequate or impossible. There was growing concern that the communal living of the small college not be lost in its populous successor.

Then came President Woodrow Wilson of Princeton, affirming (in 1909) the British concept in terms that largely reshaped the course of educational emphasis at many institutions: "The mind does not live by instruction. The real intellectual life of a body of undergraduates, if there be any, manifests itself not only in the classroom, but in what they do and talk of and set before themselves as their favorite objects *between* classes and lectures. . . .

"If you wish to create a college, therefore, and are wise, you will seek to create a life. . . . My plea, then, is this: That we reorganize our colleges on the lines of this simple conception, that a college is not only a body of studies but a mode of association. . . . It must become a *community* of scholars and pupils."

It was into this climate of ideas about what constitutes an education that the union came in America. One can see why the union became what, in a large measure, it still is—a place for students to come together and talk among themselves, a place for "comradeship."

For a time—the first quarter of the century—this seemed to be a good idea for men only. The unions of that era were unions for men only (again, the British influence). But in the 1920's when women's suffrage appeared and the ancient tradition of education-for-men-only began to dissolve, students saw that it was odd for men and women to eye each other across the campus from their respective strongholds, when they really wanted to be together; unions evolved into social centers for everybody, and have with few exceptions been thoroughly coeducational ever since.

At this juncture, in the 1920's, two circumstances came together to launch the massive union development of the last forty-five years.

There was a great postwar upsurge in enrollment in the 1920's (as after the Second World War), and students were forced into a fairly grim social existence, unless they belonged to fraternities. It was hard to find a place to eat, or for students to find each other. Colleges had seen what the canteen

and recreation centers had meant to the serviceman away from home. A counterpart on the campus--a union—now loomed importantly as an answer to many problems of campus life.

And the answer to the problem of how to get the building also came out of the war. What better type of living memorial to honor the college men who had served in the war? What better way to serve the cause of democracy than to create a new campus democracy? The memorial theme was joined to the felt need, and this fund appeal coming in a time of prosperity gave a sudden and successful impetus to the slow-maturing union movement on a wide front.

In the mid-twenties there were barely a dozen unions. Now there are more than 1000, built or being planned. The junior colleges, 850 strong and multiplying fast, are just starting to get interested, not to mention the some 400 unions already built or being planned overseas. And the end is not in sight. As of now, an estimated 800-900 additional institutions are potential builders of unions for the future.

In short, almost every college now recognizes that wherever young people are gathered together away from home, a center and program for their out-of-class life are needed if the college is to fulfill the needs of living along with learning—that the union is as normal and necessary a part of the college equipment as a gymnasium, dormitories, and library.

The Union as a Campus Community Center

The nature of the union has continued to change, and expand.

In the 1930's the leaders of the union movement, influenced greatly by the concurrent development and success of general community recreation and cultural centers, began to see the union as the campus counterpart of the "community center" elsewhere, with a positive recreational and educational mission to perform.

So the union, as a community center serving diverse needs, now embraces a wide range of facilities and has multiple functions to perform.

It is a lounge, dining room, information center, student club headquarters, reading room, art gallery, workshop, theater, music room, forum, game room, dance and party center, public relations agency, student office building, outing center, radio studio, ticket bureau, post office, conference headquarters, and book store. It may provide all of these facilities, or part of them, or perhaps still others—but all brought together in one place so that physical proximity does its part in furthering a sense of community.

Further, it is an active encourager of student management and self-expression; caterer to the campus at large, housing the bulk of its meetings and serv-

ing its dinners; advisor to student committees; trouble shooter in certain problems of student personnel; teacher of the arts of leisure and recreation. It concerns itself with the whole area of student life and interests outside the classroom. It is, or can be, the social-cultural heart of the campus.

And so the days when the union was merely "a place to meet" and a place to eat, or an incidental supplement to housing—a kind of service station, filling accidental gaps in the provisions for out-of-class needs—are long since gone. The union has become an all-purpose *community center* of the first order, with an identity and meaning of its own.

One of the outcomes that the union, as a thriving community center, makes possible is a further approach to what is familiarly known as "education for leisure." The cultivation of taste and intelligence in using discretionary time is an important part of what a union is about. The union has a unique and superlative opportunity to enhance the quality of leisure, because it is in the area of a student's leisure time that it operates.

This means, in short, that with a good union a college can vastly expand the time area in which it educates, and the means by which it educates.

An Experience in Socially Useful Leadership

Further, the union is a priceless tool for reshaping the individual student's sense of social responsibility—a natural laboratory where all who will may have a part in the direction of community enterprise, the kind of social and service institution where it can immediately be apparent that the ideals of democracy are practiced and that they work. The union, as much as any college institution, has a part in the present educational job of enlisting every student possible in a personal concern for the general welfare.

The whole educational process in America, fundamentally—as almost every college catalogue affirms—is intended to prepare young people for intelligent participation and effective leadership in our common life together.

But if college students are to be the future leaders of our society, they must have a chance to learn the ways of leadership. On the campus there is perhaps no better place than in the union, the community center—the campus counterpart of the civic, political, and social life of the thousands of communities into which students will move after graduation.

The ultimate mission of the union is, therefore—as it was the original, central mission at Oxford and Cambridge—this one of training students for their responsibilities as citizens—by providing the maximum means and tools for practicing leadership of their corporate life on the campus, thus giving a cutting edge to the foundation work of the classroom.

So it is that the union may have its highest value as a community center, a center which serves, not just as a sheltering building structure, but as a unifying force in the life of the college, as active sponsor of quality in the use of leisure, and as a fountainhead of self-directed activity that helps a student become ready and able to serve well in a democratic society.

CONCERNING THE UNION NAME

While the union building has been described, so far as general function is concerned, as the "community center" of the campus, this does not mean that "center" is recommended as a substitute name. Rather, the term "union" is considered to be most appropriate, and of great value and meaning.

"Union" states directly the goal of unity among diverse groups of people which the building fosters, much as "university," of which a union is a part, signifies unity in diversity in academic endeavors. The word "university" derives from the Latin "universitas" meaning "the whole;" union from "unio," meaning "oneness," a whole made up of united parts. In the educational world the two concepts support and complement each other.

The union name enjoys identity with a long and honored tradition in college life, a rich heritage of more than 150 years. The extensive literature on college buildings and organizations of this kind all makes reference to "unions" as the generic term. The Federal housing law authorizing loans for financing union buildings uses the identifying term "union." And the national (now international) organization is, of course, the Association of College Unions, *and has borne this name for more than 50 years.*

"Center" implies only a place. It should be noted that if "union" sometimes leads to mistaken identities, the use of the name "center" does also, and perhaps more so. There is confusion with the growing number of campus adult education centers, research centers, art centers, recreation centers, religious centers, and medical centers. And with "center" the college has a building name only; there remains the problem of what to call the membership organization which uses and operates the building, names officers, sponsors programs, and to which students and others belong.

2. THE PLANNING OF UNION BUILDINGS

The planning of a union is now regarded neither as a matter of roofing over a set of miscellaneous, unrelated facilities nor the opposite: erecting a certain kind of physical structure with pre-determined standard elements

(as with a dormitory or gymnasium). The planning of a union, in the best sense, means arriving at a comprehensive, well-considered plan for the community life of the college. The most successful unions are those that have developed as general campus community centers.

Under this approach the union becomes, fundamentally, an expression of the needs of the people of the college at leisure. Whatever interests them, whatever is important to them outside their working time becomes interesting and important also at the center of their campus life we call the union.

If a union is to respond effectively to the wide range of needs and interests of a college population at leisure, if it is to become genuinely a community center—the social and cultural heart of the campus—it will draw together in one place those facilities and activities which will give everyone in the college family—students, faculty, staff, alumni, and their guests—reasons for coming to the center.

It will provide first for the things that human beings do in their more elemental daily activity: places and means for meeting friends, for conversation, for lounging, for reading the newspapers, for dining and refreshment. In addition, and for young people especially, it will provide for dating and social occasions, and for active games. It will provide rooms and equipment that will incite activity and encourage the congeniality and friendships that come from working together on common projects. And finally, it will offer facilities that will introduce students to the enduring satisfactions of the arts, of books, of hobbies, and generally the productive use of leisure.

Provisions for personal, for dining, and for social needs will heavily populate the union. The presence and the message of the arts will add grace and purpose to social activity. Coming to the union for one activity, students will be exposed to, and perhaps inspired by, another activity. Cultural interests, community activity, and daily living thus may blend into truly an art of living, one and indivisible.

From this it follows that the known unmet social, dining, and cultural needs of the college population should be arranged for, wherever possible, in a new or expanded union; further, that the college should provide there the means of cultivating new, worthy interests that may not at the moment be in demand locally but which, upon trial, have had strong appeal to other young people and which have inherent recreational or cultural value.

It follows, also, that some realignment of campus facilities and of plans for the future may be necessary so that there will not be missing at the union an element essential to its functioning as a true center of campus life or a facility important as a matter of sheer convenience to the student-faculty body. The college will be richly repaid if with the creation of a new union,

or the expansion of an old one, the over-all design for campus living is made right, even though this involves some readjustment and shifts of existing facilities and plans.

Certainly it is a mistake in planning if the union is treated, as it still is on some campuses, merely as a catch-all for just miscellaneous college needs, without regard to their appropriateness in the union or without regard to implanting in the union the core of activity essential to a good campus center.

A Suggested Procedure

The college union, thus, has become one of the most highly complex and specialized kinds of building. In the first place, there is nothing elsewhere quite like a union; a club, hotel, or civic community center will afford no safe pattern to go by, though the union embodies characteristics of all of them. A union is much more inclusive and unique in its facilities; it may house club facilities, restaurants, snack bar, chapel, hotel, adult conference facilities, theater, music rooms, art gallery, meeting rooms, post office, hobby shops ,radio studios, game rooms, ballrooms, outing facilities, swimming pool, stores, and a multitude of offices all under one roof—a special combination of these functions or all of them.

In the second place, any union to be valid and of maximum use for a given campus, needs to reflect and strengthen the traditions and life of that particular campus and to serve the special recreation interests and community living needs of a particular campus population—always a highly individual thing. In other words, a good union is a tailor-made job. So a good union cannot be arrived at merely by consulting the plans of other unions. And it cannot be designed by an architect out of the top of his mind or the reference sheets in his files; it represents an architectural problem of the first order, requiring the maximum of imagination, research, and care.

The situation for the college has been further complicated in the past by the fact that with few exceptions the existing unions, which might otherwise be useful guides in at least some respects, have been designed by architects with no previous experience in planning a campus social-cultural center. So when other architects and planning committees have conscientiously tried to fill the gaps in their own experience by studying other union plans or by visiting nearby union buildings, the errors of the past have thus been unknowingly repeated; facilities that were good for one campus have been thoughtlessly transplanted to another where they were ill-advised; and good solutions in distant unions and new evidences of student social needs have been overlooked entirely.

It is probably correct to say that inadequate or misguided architectural planning has cost unions collectively, in both construction and operating

expense, millions of dollars. (Recently, for example, a director given the responsibility of operating a newly opened $2,500,000 union reported: "No part of it works well and some parts not at all.")

What can be done to get better results?

First of all, the college would do well to start with a careful study of its own needs and a formulation of a guiding philosophy and program of what it wants the union to do for its campus, rather than looking for pat answers in other union plans. A thorough-going survey of the local campus situation and careful sampling of large numbers of students to learn their facility preferences will be useful, almost indispensable.

How many students are housed in organized houses and have a social life—and dining rooms—of their own? What are the distinguishing local student social and recreational customs? What do students want that they haven't already got? What else does the campus or town offer recreationally? What facilities should be logically shifted to the union to make it complete? What objectives in informal student education is the union expected to accomplish?

How will each campus organization make use of the new center and how often? Will townspeople and conference groups use it? How many students live at home or at a distance from the campus? How many commute and need a parking place? Future enrollment prospects? Ratio of men to women? What are the college plans for future dormitories and dining halls? Theater? Conference center? And many other similar factors, which the architects will want to know about and out of all of which the desirable nature of the union will emerge.

There is value, of course, in learning what other unions are like and what facilities and programs are popular and profitable. There is danger in assuming that all relevant and necessary information is present on the campus and in the faculty. Worse still if the union is assigned simply to the architects, or to one college office, to plan. So, to gain perspective and not miss any good bets, it is highly useful to have a planning committee which brings together as much union information as possible, through visits to representative unions and through the aid of the publications of the Association of College Unions—providing such information is intelligently sifted and applied to the local circumstances. And it is important to combine all the findings and recommendations in a detailed and specific "building program"—a comprehensive written statement of purposes, functions, areas, and estimated

costs—which ultimately receives the final approval of the college administration and trustees.

Then comes the stage of active architectural planning, not before.

A list of firms and individuals who have rendered professional services in planning unions (architects; interior decorators; building program and planning consultants; kitchen, electrical, and acoustic consultants) may be obtained by writing to the Association central office.

Included in the list are the names of union directors who are sometimes available to work on a professional basis with the architect and the local planning committee as consultants to advise on operating requirements of a new building, to assist in conducting a survey of facility needs and prepare a building program for the architect, and to check drawings from an operator's standpoint.

Some Principles and Cautions

It is never possible to prescribe solutions closely and wisely without a study of the variant local conditions, but a few typical principles and cautions (there are many others) may at least be suggestive of the nature of the union planning problem:

1. In selecting the site and planning the building, start with the assumption of growth. No one has the last word on what the college may want the union to be and do twenty years from now, or even ten. Most unions are not nearly large enough. Many have built two or three additions; some are now two to five times as large as when they first opened. A building design is not right that is final and cannot be added to later.

2. Union building development, more often than not, is a development in stages—mainly because of initial fund limitations, though sometimes because of doubt concerning the size or need for one or more units until other college developments take place, or because it is uneconomical to operate and maintain a plant designed for, say, a future enrollment of 8,000 students during the interim when there are only 4000-5000 students.

Obviously, when several units of a building can be constructed at one time, there are substantial savings in cost, as compared to building the same units in stages; and if the needs are clear and the initial funds sufficient, this is sometimes the wisest course (though such construction savings may be largely offset by the greater expense of amortizing, operating, and maintaining the larger plant until enrollment expands and the building is more fully utilized, and more fully supported by the income generated by such increased use).

But by and large, construction in stages has seemed the more feasible and practical course, providing that those facilities which are built are located so that they can be well integrated with future units (for which site space has been reserved) and are themselves of sufficient size so that they won't be overcrowded and require extensive alteration and expansion two or three years after the building opens.

3. Study each facility with a view to its possibilities for multiple uses, and where multiple purpose is genuinely feasible, provide the basic design and accessory space and equipment that will make it work for the purpose intended (i.e., adequate servery space and table and chair storage for the ballroom which is to be used as a banquet hall; enclosed, fire-code approved projection booth for the ballroom to be used for motion pictures; a flooring suitable for dancing in the dining room to be used for parties). Do not assume, however, that *all* rooms can serve multiple purposes; a typical serious mistake is to plan a large lounge on the theory that it can serve also as a dance hall, or that a lounge or browsing library or corridors can serve successfully as an art gallery. There are many other instances where multiple use does not work.

4. Take into account that peak loads are characteristic of college dining and union social occasions. Arrange and relate facilities (i.e., checkrooms, lobby, meeting rooms, dining rooms, ballrooms, circulation and line-up space) so that a given facility can be readily expanded for peak loads, or contracted for normal use.

5. Group facilities of like function together whenever possible (i.e., all games units together, with one central control desk; "quiet" areas together; administrative offices together). Some facilities must be on the ground floor; others work best in the basement or the second or even third floors. Size requirements should be determined by what people need, and what an experienced union operator knows to be necessary in actual practice. Let the building plan develop accordingly. Don't expect construction economy, operating efficiency, convenience, or the greatest usefulness if the architect is bound to a scheme of formal symmetry, a campus "style" of architecture, or a strict modular structural system into which facilities have to fit, regardless of what this does to the facility.

6. Do not overlook the importance of providing adequately for the following:

Parking (a union isolated from auto access and parking suffers critically, both financially and socially, from loss of use; as one veteran union director has said, "Parking sets a ceiling on everything the union does").

Snack Bar (considered by students the most essential single facility to have in a union; more important as a casual drop-in and lounging center to students than a regular lounge; usually much too small).

Facilities that meet the special needs of commuters (lockers, dressing rooms, "quiet rooms" with cots, and, of course, parking).

Rooms for small parties (usually much more demand for these than for a large ballroom).

Facilities for food catering in rooms used for group meetings and social activities.

Space near main traffic centers for large bulletin boards, student displays, ticket selling, information tables, and balloting.

Facilities for adult conferences and short courses (most unions serve as conference centers).

7. Provide for plenty of meeting rooms. Colleges almost always underestimate their needs for this facility; the rooms they do provide are usually unnecessarily large. (The most frequent demand for meeting rooms, for example, is for groups under thirty).

8. Consider fully that a union is no longer merely a place to eat and meet, but has to do broadly with the constructive employment of student time outside the classroom, that it represents an experience in a way of living. Hence, consider facilities for cultural and creative pursuits (theater or auditorium, music rooms, library, art display space), for hobbies, photography, and crafts, for motion pictures, and for outdoor activity (outing headquarters and program) as well as for social and dining activity. (In numerous surveys students show they consider a theater one of the most important of all union facilities).

9. Consider with special care whether or not it is advantageous locally to include these facilities:

Bookstore
Merchandise shops
Faculty lounges or club quarters
Hotel unit
Swimming pool
Separate lounges for men and women
Offices for college administrative officers (other than union), alumni and religious organizations
Beauty shop, barber shop
Chapel
Health clinic

Staff apartment
Ballroom for large dances

These are facilities about which there is widely varying opinion. On some campuses separate lounges, non-union offices, quarters exclusively for faculty, beauty shops, chapel, alumni offices, and staff apartments have been abandoned or have met with doubtful success. Some believe certain facilities in the above list (i.e., chapel, health clinic, merchandise shops, even bookstore) have a doubtful relation to the central purposes of a union. And currently there is a fairly universal downtrend in interest in large all-campus dances. On the other hand, compelling local circumstances sometimes provide special justification for inclusion of certain of the facilities in question.

10. Observe the natural flow of traffic on the campus; choose a location and include in the building those services and facilities that give students reason to use it almost daily—if you would have a *social* center.

11. The kitchen and service counters should not be planned—in size and layout—without the counsel of a professional food service consultant, or of an experienced union food director. Typical norms for hotel, restaurant, or dormitory kitchens are not safe guides in planning for the peak loads and the special catering services of a union.

12. Many social and service facilities are natural "feeders" to income facilities (i.e., informal dance area in the Snack Bar, mail boxes near the Snack Bar). Plan the relationship accordingly.

13. Plan student office space flexibly and avoid permanent commitments to prospective office holders. Private student offices are expensive and often are little used. Many student organizations can share a common office area. Others need only storage lockers for belongings or accessible files.

14. Plan, at least broadly, the nature and number of building staff members and employees before going too far, and then make provisions for offices and employee quarters accordingly. Employ the union director *before* the building is built so that he can assist in the planning, help insure that operating requirements are met, understand fully himself how the plant is to work, and assemble and train an operating staff before the building opens.

15. Provide plenty of storage space. There is never enough, and what there is is usually not in the right places. Hundreds, even thousands, of dollars annually in servicing costs can be saved through experienced planning.

16. Remember that students are rarely interested in just a place to sit down. Plan rooms and lounges in which students can do something—listen to music, read, play games, pursue hobbies, make things, produce shows, view art works, plan activity. Avoid large formal lounges (because students avoid them); likewise avoid lounges that must serve as traffic-ways to other facilities.

17. Plan entrances, lounges, library, music rooms, game rooms, workshops, and telephones with an eye to easy visual supervision by the staff.

18. Plan the interior circulation so that large crowds attending an organized event will pass a control point (i.e., for collection of admission tickets) and at the same time permit individuals and other groups proceeding to other parts of the building to by-pass the control point.

19. There are physical means to social (and financial) ends. Many facilities substantially fail of their purpose because they lack air conditioning, acoustic treatment, appropriate lighting, suitable furniture, or appealing decor.

20. Investigate carefully the kinds of floor and wall coverings, equipment and furnishings that work best in a union. Few buildings receive harder and more continuous use.

21. There are many ways to save building space and labor and maintenance costs—elevators, tray conveyors, automatic waste disposal, proven floor and wall finishes, public address systems, combining of service functions at control desks, centralization of dining and service facilities, etc.—which should not be overlooked.

22. Don't make it hard to get into the building. No service institution which seriously cares about having people use its facilities would remove the building very far from the sidewalk or interpose the obstacle of a monumental flight of steps at the entrance. And the many physically handicapped persons on a campus require ramps at the entrance or handrails, on both sides of steps, they can grip readily.

While the architect cannot control what goes into the building, he can see to it that whatever facilities are chosen are blessed with an environment that is humane. And he can see to it that the architecture is fitting to the purpose; an invitation to informality, human in scale; creative rather than imitative; and, hopefully, inspirational.

For the union of its very nature is a center of artistic as well as social experience. As the scene of daily living for students, the building's architectural form, its decoration and furnishings, and its pictures and sculpture have subtle and continuing influence on the standards of taste of its young users.

Also see the 1963 general survey of existing union facilities by Boris Bell (published by the Association in booklet form), and a detailed discussion of "Planning for a College Union" by Frank Noffke, published in 1965. The Noffke pamphlet and the reprint of "The College Union Story" by Porter Butts, appearing in the March, 1964, Journal of the American Institute of Architects, include an extensive bibliography on union building planning.

The Association, with the aid of a large grant from the Educational Facilities Laboratories has published (in 1966) a 112-page illustrated research study, "Planning College Union Facilities for Multiple Use," also by Butts. It includes 20 case examples, diagrams and photos, analyses of possible cost savings and an appendix on Operable Partitions.

3. GENERAL ORGANIZATION OF A UNION AND ITS ACTIVITIES

Boards and Committees

The prevalent practice in organizing a union (75% of the cases) is to establish, under authority of a constitution approved by the college trustees or regents, a general union governing board comprising representatives of the typical college groups which use the union and pay for a large part of its operating cost through membership fees or payments for services.

These component groups of the college community are students, faculty, alumni, and college administrative staff. Their representatives are chosen variously by the appointment or elective method, or by a combination of the two methods, according to local institutional practice.

Faculty members are usually appointed by the college president; alumni members are appointed by the president or alumni association; and students are either elected by the student body, appointed by the out-going union governing board on the basis of previous service or special merit, or serve ex-officio because they are officers of the general student government body. In the case of students the selection pattern sometimes combines two or all three of the methods mentioned. Appointment, or "selection," based upon merit of candidates who have served apprenticeship on union committees, is the predominant method (rather than campus-wide election). Selection is considered more likely to insure the presence of students better qualified to carry out the rather specialized administrative responsibilities expected of them; it removes essential social and cultural programming for the campus from the arena of personal popularity contests or irrelevant battles between campus political parties.

In 1963 a general survey of 190 unions, conducted for the Association by Boris Bell, director of the University of Rhode Island Union, showed that 93% of all general union governing boards included faculty representatives, 90% included one or more union staff representatives, 87% general student government representatives, 71% students of the union's program board, 55% students representing the general student body, 65% the dean of student

affairs, 53% alumni representatives, and about half included the president of the college and/or a representative of the business office.

Most often a student is chairman of the policy board (57% of the cases); otherwise the chairman is a representative of the faculty or administration (33%), or a union staff member (10%).

This general governing board ordinarily has broad *policy-making* functions (i.e., policies regarding building use, space allocation, services to be offered, approval of student committee appointments and program budgets). It is directly responsible for the policies under which the union functions, but, with few exceptions, reports to the college administration and trustees, who are ultimately responsible.

There is usually a second board comprised entirely, or largely, of students which has the functions of *program* planning and *program* administration. These students are usually chosen (87% of the cases) on the basis of past union service and special interest and aptitude in one or more areas of union programming. This primarily student board heads up and coordinates a series of student union committees (4 to 25 committees with a total of from 50 to 700 members—average of 8 committees, with an average membership of about 14 students per committee). These committees have the day to day responsibility for planning and presenting social and cultural programs (dance, special events, lectures and discussion, music, art, games, hospitality, films, outing, crafts, etc.). In 92% of the cases the chairman of the student programming board is a student, and in 8% of the cases a union staff member.

It is generally agreed that the union's student board should work in close cooperation with, but definitely independently of, the general campus student government board. In only 17% of the cases reported in the 1963 Association survey was the union program board responsible to student government.

Members of the union staff usually work with student committees and the program board in an advisory capacity, providing continuity, furnishing useful information, coordinating plans with college policies, counseling students in the performance of their duties, and helping to organize leadership training programs.

Professional Staff

The success of a union depends not upon the adequacy of the building but upon the adequacy of volunteer student committees and of the paid staff, and the quality of their leadership.

There are—as in the conduct of the college as a whole—two staff functions to be performed in every union, large or small, each paralleling and

supplementing the other and both under one directing and coordinating head: (1) the *educational function* which includes the direction of a recreation program for the campus and the counseling (even organized instruction) of students—individuals and groups—in social, educational, and recreational fields; and (2) the *business and administrative function* of operating the building plant and its varied services.

In practice (especially in small buildings) both educational and administrative functions are often discharged by the same personnel. It should be pointed out that where these dual responsibilities are assumed in large measure by the same person, it is often at the expense of one function or the other, and that most unions, regardless of size, have need for two types of personnel each especially qualified and free, under the coordinating direction of the union director, to concentrate their efforts in either the educational or the management fields, respectively.

Regarding *numbers* of key staff members or supervisors, there is no standard formula, nor should the number necessarily be conditioned by the size of the building plant or student body, especially in the case of the social and educational staff. Rather, the size of the staff should be determined by the needs of students and the purposes which the college expects the union to fulfill.

The number of full time department heads and directors of special activities varies among unions from three to as many as 24. According to a 1960 survey, the average number of professional staff members—both educational and administrative—at unions of all sizes (94 responding) was 5.7.

In the 1963 Association survey, of 64 colleges and universities under 2500 enrollment, 41% reported only one "professional" staff member, 22% reported two, 21% reported three, and 11% reported four. 49% of 47 institutions with enrollments of 2500-4999 reported three to more than six professional staff members; 55% of 38 institutions with enrollments of 5000-9999 reported four to more than six; and 63% of 30 institutions with enrollments over 10,000 reported five to more than six. (Only the number of "top staff positions" up to six was asked for in the survey).

With regard to program staff only, the 1960 survey of 94 unions showed that virtually all unions had at least one staff member working in the program field and 70% had more than one (average of 2.2). With the rapid growth of union emphasis on program, the average is now undoubtedly higher.

A clue to the relative sufficiency of the union staff at a given college will be given by an examination of the number of staff members appointed to care for the physical health and physical recreation and sports program of a

student body in comparison to the number appointed at the union to care for the social health and social-cultural recreation program of the same students.

Or, as a president of the Association pointedly asked in a recent conference paper, "Why not weigh the virtue of a popular entertainer walking off your campus after two hours with $6000 in his pocket against a full year of added staff counsel and guidance devoted to that 'training of students in social responsibility and leadership' we so loudly proclaim in our brochures?"

One rule of thumb*—so far as the educational or program staff is concerned—is that there should be one full time program advisor for each three general areas of programming *if* the student planners are to have a valuable learning experience and *if* the program is to be of the kind and quality the student-faculty body deserves. By an "area of programming" is meant not advising a committee of the sort that plans a single event or a series of events, but an *area of interest,* such as music programming in all its aspects, or social, or film. Thus, if a union is to do well what it can and should do with music, social activities, and films, it needs one full time program advisor for these three areas alone. If there are nine such areas, which is about the average for most unions—extending on through games, arts and crafts, forums and lectures, special projects, outings, publicity and public relations, etc.—then a union needs three full time program staff members. And this applies almost as fully to the small campus as to the large, granted the all-important *if*—if there is to be an adequate program and a truly meaningful experience for student planners and participants.

One important practical consideration often overlooked by college administrations in staffing a union is that union buildings normally operate seven days a week, including holidays, from early morning to late evening—in other words, two eight-hour work days each day of the week. The requirements for staff supervision during a sixteen-hour day and a seven-day week appropriately should lead to an increase in the number of supervisory positions in a union over those provided for the normal eight-hour, five or five-and-a-half-day operation of other college departments. Otherwise injury will either be done to the program or to the staff members who are given supervisory and administrative responsibility during these long hours. One of the great weaknesses in union staff organization in the past has been due to the failure of the administration to recognize that when the usual four to five o'clock office closing time comes on the campus another full work day is just beginning at the union, with the heaviest supervisory load often falling in the evening and on Saturdays and Sundays.

---

* *Proposed in "The Government and Staffing of a Union," a paper presented in the 1962 Wisconsin Union Summer Course in College Union Operations.*

All members of the union staff—educational and administrative—should have a conception of the community center's place and purpose in the college educational scheme, an understanding of the recreation and cultural needs of students, and an interest in making a student's experience within the union of educative and self-development value.

There is no recommendation that a candidate necessarily be an alumnus of the appointing institution. This arises from the strong belief that the qualifications of the applicant to do well the job at hand should be the matter of paramount concern, whether an alumnus or not. The wise college administration does not think of limiting its choices of union staff members to alumni any more than it limits its choices of football coaches, history professors, or comptrollers to its own graduates. The fresh viewpoints and the successful experience contributed by a staff member from another institution have often proved of inestimable value in the union as in other college fields.

A useful principle in approaching the question of compensation is this: each college has in its salary scales for other college teaching and administrative positions its own general measure of ability to pay and of the level of performance it expects. The union director, in the view of many college administrations and of the Association of College Unions, should hold the same status and have the same salary (granted the necessary preparation and the same effectiveness of performance) as the directors of other major divisions or departments of the college. Other key union staff members would then stand in the same relative position to their director—in salary scale and status—as the college is able to afford for assistants of the same training and effectiveness in other college divisions.

(Descriptions of typical union staff positions, desirable qualifications of candidates, and suggested salary ranges are given in a pamphlet published by the Association of College Unions, "Standards for Professional Staff Preparation and Compensation in College Union Work").

(An extensive study of "The Administrative Responsibilities, Work Environment, Experience, and Recommended Curricular Preparation of the Union Director"—a doctor's thesis by James W. Lyons—is available on interlibrary loan from the Indiana University Library).

Centralization of Management

Emphasis is placed by the Association of College Unions upon the desirability and importance of having a single directing and coordinating head of the union plant and its departmental operations.

In an Association survey among 200 unions on this particular subject, two-thirds of the institutions reporting reported single, centralized manage-

ment of the union, with the most popular chain of command being from regents or trustees to college president to a general union governing board to the union director to the various operating departments of the union building. Of the unions reporting divided management (i.e., food service at the union under the management of a separate general campus food department, or social program under the direction of a dean's office, or building housekeeping administered by the physical plant department), only a few believe in and advocate such separation of authority.

(It should be noted that centralized management does not result merely from the preference of a union director; it has necessarily been the outcome of the combined policy decisions of business offices, presidents, and trustees).

It is probable that those reporting in the survey mentioned above considered that where the college contracted with a commercial firm to render food service the commercial caterer was under the direction of the union, because the 1963 Association survey showed that of 174 unions 42% managed their own food service and 20% used a commercial caterer—total of 62% or about two-thirds. In 29% of the cases union food service was managed by a separate college dining department, with the remaining 9% following an assortment of arrangements.

The bookstore presents a special situation, partly because only about 60% of all unions include bookstores—in contrast to food services, social-cultural programs, and housekeeping and building maintenance, which are universally necessary accompaniments of union operation. When the store is in the union, there is widely divided opinion regarding who should manage it. In practice the union is responsible for management in only 29% of the cases. Much more commonly the space is leased, either to a private operator (6%) or to a store organization which reports to the college business office.

The prevalent view, favoring total and centralized management of the union by the union, except for the bookstore, runs as follows:

The various operating departments of a union building need to be on the basis of a "combined operation" every day, with a single unified command. A single command, in principle, is as necessary here as in an armed forces operation. Otherwise, there is divided responsibility for results, with alibis and buck-passing; less flexible and efficient use of employee manpower and of building facilities; difficulties in scheduling multiple-purpose rooms; a slowdown in making plans and decisions; variant standards in performance and maintenance; inability to take care of complaints effectively; danger of conflicting loyalties among employee groups; dissatisfaction on the part of all the various responsible operating heads.

On the positive side, a single director of over-all operations is able to

muster *all* resources and services of a union toward the achievement of a goal, and students and faculty have the opportunity, through their governing board, of affecting all, not just part, of the policies and program of the building.

There is no such thing as *separate* management and *separate* social functions of a union. The two functions are inter-locked at every point, and it shouldn't require an extended diplomatic conference, as say between the union director and the food manager or between the union director and the dean of students, every time it is desired to do something new or special.

The union suffers when there is divided management. The food service, for example, can make or break the union budget and reputation, since it is the main financial support of most unions other than the student fee and affects more people personally and importantly every day than anything else that happens in the union. Though some one else may manage the food service, the union can not avoid the impact of the results—financially and in terms of the attitude of patrons. By whomever the service is managed, it is the "Union" as far as the student-faculty public is concerned. The union director ought to have authority, as well as responsibility, real or implied. Otherwise, he is in the position of an athletic director who has nothing to say about the hiring-firing of department coaches.

One long-time observer of union operations has said: "Besides an inadequate staff, there is nothing more devastating to the effective performance of a union than cutting it up into pieces to be managed by separate agencies, with the union staff—what is left—handicapped in trying to realize either the service or the educational objectives the governing board— or indeed the college—seeks."

(For further data on current management practices see the 1963 Association survey conducted by Boris Bell).

Relation of the Union to the College

In a very few instances there is no official legal relationship between the union and the college.* The extreme cases are those unions which were begun by alumni associations or the Associated Students (as on the West Coast) almost independently of any responsibility on the part of their colleges, and which operate under alumni corporations or an independent student associa-

---

* *While there are only a few cases of unions operating separately from the college in the U.S., it is common that unions outside the U.S. operate quite independently of their colleges, or attempt to. An extensive discussion of union relationships with the administrative offices of their institutions, in 60 countries, is given in "State of the College Union Around the World" by Porter Butts (published by the Association in 1967).*

tion; the title of the union building and land rests with the alumni corporation or the student association and the college has little or no jurisdiction. This situation has been rapidly changing to one of college jurisdiction as the complications under non-college ownership of maintaining tax exemption, legally assessing a compulsory student operating fee, and financing bond issues or loans for construction have become apparent.

A number of unions operate almost strictly as business enterprises or service agencies without educational purposes or results, functioning more nearly like hotels or clubs than college unions, as now generally conceived. The proportion of unions without educational program goals, however, has decreased sharply in recent years.

For the most part, unions have been established as departments or divisions of the college, coordinate with other student welfare and service departments and reporting to the president or to his representative (as, for example, to the business manager in business matters).

According to a survey of 445 institutions made by the U.S. Office of Education in 1962-63 (published in 1966), 36% of all union directors report to the president, 26% to the chief student service officer, 11% to the chief business officer, 7% to an academic or administrative vice-president, and the remainder to a variety of college officers—as well as, of course, to the union policy board. Reporting to the president appears to be on the increase, especially in smaller institutions.

Though there are some discrepant points of view, some discrepant cases, the trend is toward greater recognition of the educational potentialities of the union and consequently toward closer relationships of the union to the college's educational organization and program.

Few colleges have explicit organizational relationships for the professional working-together of union officers and other staff members of the college beyond the administrative line responsibility of the union staff to the president or his representative. Most prefer as a general policy, others as an occasional arrangement, inter-departmental planning on a consultative or conference basis without organizational provisions of a prescribed nature.

Relation to Educational Programs

The general educational aims of the union, as described in Chapter 1, are to prepare students for leisure as well as for work, to make the recreation of students and the campus environment cooperative factors with study in student education, and to assist in achieving the college goal of preparing students for leadership and community responsibilities. These aims have grown out of the widely held view of educators that what the college does educationally in the hours outside the classroom is of major importance.

The avenues of approach utilized at the union include the following:

1. Provision of a general social-cultural program for the campus, aiming to help students broaden personal horizons and achieve a balanced, healthy life through rewarding recreation, and to create an environment outside the classroom which encourages creative and constructive endeavors and the learning process generally.

2. The counseling and training of student volunteers (the union committees) in the presentation of the union program for the campus.

3. Workshops on group leadership.

4. The teaching on a rather wide scale of social and recreation skills designed to aid students in developing personal social competence and confidence.

5. The provision of laboratory situations, and at times organized credit or non-credit instruction, for students who are preparing for career leadership in the fields and professions related to the union—recreation leadership, community center work, art gallery administration, concert or theater management, institutional management, or the union field itself.

The programs and services which the union staff supervises and for which it trains student volunteer leadership are related to many departments. Community social and cultural life, the concern of the union, at once touches several other corollary subject matter fields (group work, recreation leadership, education, journalism, English literature, art, drama, music, etc.) necessitating a complex of cooperative teaching and service arrangements.

In some cases the union co-sponsors a program with another department (i.e., a concert with the music department or a creative writing contest with the English department). In some cases a departmental faculty member serves as advisor of a union student committee (i.e., art department faculty member as advisor of the union art exhibition committee). In other cases a faculty member is asked to lead or teach a student group in the union (i.e., square dancing or craft class). And in still other cases the union staff member is appointed by another department to conduct the laboratory section of a credit class or supervise thesis studies (i.e., institutional management, group leadership, recreation field work, or student activity counseling).

Relation to Student Affairs Agencies

Some unions render direct counseling services to other student organizations. (The 1963 Association survey showed that about half of all union directors also had non-union duties, and of these 29% served as general student activity advisors, especially in the smaller colleges). Some serve as

the central agency for reservations of all campus halls for non-instructional purposes and prepare the all-college calendar of events for clearance by a college "Student Affairs" committee. On a number of campuses union staff members are participant members of "Student Personnel Councils."

The assumption is sometimes made that because the union involves students outside the classroom it is ipso facto part of the student personnel program and belongs in the student personnel organizational structure; hence, should be under the direction of the dean of student affairs.

This tends to overlook that the union also has extensive responsibilities to faculty, alumni, conference groups (83% of all unions serve adult education conferences), teaching departments, and many others, not to mention heavy financial responsibilities that run to the business manager. And especially it overlooks the merits of *self*-direction on the part of the student, faculty, and alumni members and users of the union.

There is usually no college office which includes an official concern with *all* the groups and interests with which the union deals except the president's office; hence a union governing board which represents all interests, with line responsibility to the president's office and on to the trustees, as outlined in the foregoing sections of this chapter.

At the same time there is a trend toward greater coordination with student welfare and personnel services through periodic joint conferences, the adoption of common procedures and policies, reports by the union director to a vice-president in general charge of student affairs, and sometimes interlocking board and committee personnel. (For example, appointment of the dean of student affairs to the union governing board, and of the union director to the general student affairs committee or a campus recreation planning council).

Legislative and College Recognition of Educational Function

The recognition of the educational value and necessity of the union in the over-all educational program of the college has reached the point where state legislatures or college trustees, or both together, in numerous cases have made direct appropriations from general state or college funds for the total or partial financing of the construction of union buildings. In a survey by the U.S. Office of Education state institutions planning unions for the period 1965-70 reported they expected 29% of the funds to come from state appropriations.*

Congress, in amending the Federal housing loan program in 1955, ear-

---

** All the unions at the national universities in Japan are constructed with tax funds provided through the national Ministry of Education.*

marked loan funds for colleges and universities for "educational facilities," including "unions" specifically by name—for the first time in Federal legislation establishing the union as an identity in its own right and as an "educational facility" deserving government encouragement and support.

A number of colleges make provisions for certain union staff salaries in the instructional or student personnel service budgets. Some designate the union explicitly as an educational division of the college.

The 1963 survey showed 44% of all union directors are accorded faculty rank, up from 30% in 1952.

Relation to the Business Office

The relation of the union to the business office varies greatly from campus to campus.

In some cases (13% of the total, according to the 1963 survey) the union, even though a college department, formulates its own policies and keeps its own books independently of the business office, while in others no accounting records are kept by the union.

In some instances (11%) the heads of the union are advised in financial matters by the union governing board; in others (30%) there is administrative line responsibility of the union staff to the business manager (otherwise the president or dean). In only 12% of the cases does the business office unilaterally establish general business policy for the union. The most prevalent practice (49%) is for the business office and the union to set policy jointly. In general, the union conforms to overall college policy in financial and business matters which also affect the union.

In the case of conflict between the college policy and the desires of the union governing board, the union staff attempts reconciliation through conference and recommendation. If the differences cannot be reconciled, the college policy controls (where the union is a department of the college), but with the governing board having an avenue of appeal to the president, or to the college board of trustees or regents. Such appeal is seldom found necessary.

In the main, the union looks to the business office for direction in:

1. Coordination of wage levels (55% of the cases) and general employee policies such as sick leave, vacation allowances, holidays, retirement, group and hospital insurance, etc. (62%).

2. Accounting and purchasing policies and procedures (76%).

3. Establishment of financial policies including food price coordination with other college food departments (40%), profit goals (48%), and amount of reserves for repairs and replacements (59%). In some cases—food service

(8%), profit goals (16%), and reserves (9%)—policies are the responsibility of the union governing board).

In addition, the business office often functions as a servicing agency for the union in the following matters: 1. Collects union fees from students at registration time. 2. Serves as depository for all union receipts. 3. Makes audits. 4. Processes requisitions, invoices, and payrolls. 5. Carries reserves as interest-bearing accounts.

Closely allied with the business office on most campuses are the central purchasing department, the personnel department, and the department of buildings and grounds. In general it is necessary for the union to work through these departments. Experience has shown that it may not always be as economical or as satisfactory to have the physical plant department do repairs (because of higher college wage rates and benefits, lack of skilled craftsmen, delays in service, overhead charges on central storeroom, etc.), but there are other factors that often make it desirable, or necessary, to rely upon the physical plant staff.

Methods of Financial Reporting and Control

Where a union is a department of the college, the college ordinarily exercises such financial control as it deems necessary. How far it goes depends in part on what each office—union and college business office—is prepared to do.

A useful principle in attaining the most effective direction and management of the building is to give the managing organization within the union all the desirable tools of management, including record keeping and internal controls.

The union should have available at all times detailed records of operation for the information of and utilization by both the union management and the college business office.

While the procedures of financial reporting and control for a union vary in detail and in completeness, the following measures, representative of 180 unions in the 1963 Association survey, may be found suggestive as a guide (the %'s in parentheses indicate the percentage of the 180 institutions which follow the practice stated).

The union:

1. Prepares its own budget for submission to the college administration and governing body (88%). (Student committees usually assist only in preparing the budget for social and cultural activities).
2. Keeps detailed records of income and expense. (84%).
3. Maintains daily cash sheets.

4. Sends summaries of cash sheets to the business office with the cash receipts and cash register tapes. (63%).

5. Approves all invoices and sends to the business office for payment. (86%).

6. Prepares payrolls and sends to the business office where the checks are drawn. (75%).

7. Keeps separate records for dining and other revenue-producing departments and for house (or non-revenue) department. (75%).

8. Prepares a monthly statement of income and expense for the information of the business office. (44%).

9. Prepares a report for the full year of operation for the record and for inclusion in the annual report of the business office on all college operations. (49%).

Financial operations are recorded in control accounts in the business office; union records are regularly reconciled to these accounts. (68%).

An audit of union financial operations and records is made regularly by or at the direction of the business office.

The relationship with the business office is likely to work out best (a) if the union recognizes there are certain over-all fiscal and budget policies that apply to *all* college operations, and conforms without question; (b) if the college recognizes that the union director is the key party responsible for the total outcome of the union enterprise, including all its financial operations, in the same sense that a dean or director of athletics is in charge of the destinies of the program *he* heads; (c) if the business office gives the union the necessary tools of good management to work with, including record keeping and internal cost controls, so the union knows what's happening and can do something about it promptly; and (d) when the union director and the business manager sit down and determine together what the dining profit margin and other financial objectives ought to be.

If the union is given real responsibility for the conduct of its financial affairs—not partial or fictitious responsibility—the union can take quite a burden off the business office. And the business office in its turn can perform extremely helpful services in terms of financial counsel, central purchasing, and, best of all, sympathetic understanding that *students* are playing a part in the union operation and are entitled to some elbow room—including mistakes—in financial practice; also understanding that the union is the show case of the college, has to earn its own way, and therefore needs a different approach in maintenance and what it spends money for than "Science Hall."

CONCERNING THE TERM, "AUXILIARY ENTERPRISE"

It has become the custom in college business reports and certain government publications on higher education to categorize unions as "auxiliary enterprises," along with food facilities, infirmaries, bookstores, print shops, and laundries—an outcome, apparently, of an accidental circumstance dating back to 1922 when business officers sought a convenient means of distinguishing, for accounting purposes, between those college operations supported by appropriated funds, fees, and gifts on the one hand and miscellaneous self-generated receipts (receipts from ticket sales for music school performances at the time) on the other hand.

There were scarcely a dozen unions in existence in this country in 1922 and their functions were not then well developed or well understood. So obviously it was not a label devised to apply to unions. But the term gained in usage by business offices over the years, apparently proving a handy way to classify the receipts of many revenue-producing activities, including those of unions.

Anyone reading this booklet will be aware that the term is inadequate and misleading. It suggests only a service agency or business "enterprise." It obscures the primary function of the union as a social-cultural center for informal education. It affects in important ways in many quarters what the union is expected to do, how it is governed, where it appears in the college organization chart, how it is staffed, and what is spent in effort and funds to develop a program of educational worth.

The term has led many to assume that the union is an auxiliary agency of the business office, or some other college department (though it is not). It has led others, who know something of the implications of accounting for revenues produced, to infer that the union has business and service functions only, or that it is, or should be, fully *self-supporting (which it is not) like the bookstores, dining halls, laundries, printshops, etc., with which it is bracketed. This again has often resulted in a misconception of what the union is and how it operates, affecting budgeting and facility decisions, and producing local misunderstanding and controversy over the goals for the union, including whether or not the union should be responsible solely to the business office.*

In the interests of public understanding and as a means of aiding in realizing the true potential of unions for informal education and for enrichment of the social-cultural life of the college, the Association of College Unions Executive Committee recommends that the following terms be used in describing the nature and function of college unions:

"Revenue producing" or "partly self-supporting"—when necessary for the classification of accounts.

"Campus community facilities"—for purposes of general college reporting with respect to facilities.

"College union"—for purposes of reporting according to function or of organization charting, and where it is useful or desirable to use one term uniformly for all purposes.

A full discussion of the origin of the auxiliary enterprise term and the reasons why it is considered inappropriate and injurious is found in the Association BULLETIN *of April, 1964.*

4. FINANCIAL POLICIES

Most unions are financially self-sustaining, paying for costs of operation and administration from student membership fees and building earnings (mainly dining, bookstore, games, ticket sales, supply sales, and rental of space).

Funds for Construction

In the 1963 Association survey of methods of financing construction, 190 unions showed the sources of financing construction of their buildings to be as follows:

Source of Funds*	Public Institutions (130)	Private Institutions (60)
Federal housing loan (HUD)	46%	28%
Union student fee accumulations	29	13
General subscription campaign (alumni, faculty, friends)	22	20
State or city appropriation	15	—
Large single gift	13	30
College funds	11	35
Federal grant (PWA, 1930's)	6	3
Surpluses from union operation	5	—
Surpluses from operation of other college enterprises	1	1
Sale of old building	1	—

**Commercial revenue bond financing was omitted in the survey data. This is a substantial method of union financing in the case of tax exempt public institutions. Approximately 15% of all funds for union construction at state and city institutions come from this source.*

Institutions in numbers of cases have turned to more than one source of funds—commonly borrowing supplemented by gifts and student fee accumulations, the fee being levied well in advance of the opening of the building and providing equity funds often amounting to 15-30% of construction costs.

Private colleges, much more than public, have relied upon gifts and general college building funds.

In recent years state legislatures have played an increasingly prominent part in establishing unions at public institutions—by direct appropriation, by matching grants, by purchasing sites, and by specific legislation facilitating borrowing.

Since the 1955 amendment to the Federal housing act, Federal loans at low interest rates for terms up to 40 years have been a great impetus to the whole union development. More than 400 unions, or additions to unions, have been financed in part by HUD funds, and there has never been a default on principal or interest.

Amortization of Debt

Many unions in completing their buildings have incurred debt averaging up to 60-65% of the cost of plant construction, and up to 100% of the cost of furnishings and equipment, of remodeling, and of plant additions. (A few unions have financed up to 100% of construction by borrowing—at increased interest rates and, of course, with higher-than-usual student fees).

Such indebtedness (usually in the form of a Federal housing loan or of revenue bonds, sometimes mortgages secured by pledge of revenues) is most often retired out of the combined fee and net operating receipts of the union—over a 20 to 40 year period in the case of the building, and over a 10 to 15 year period in the case of furnishings and equipment.

Amortization charges are a first lien on union receipts. Principal reliance of both the Federal Housing Agency and private financing houses is on the compulsory student union fee and the college trustees' authority to levy, and if necessary raise, the fee. In some cases (23%, according to the 1963 Association survey) union fees are pledged exclusively to retirement of indebtedness, but this method has many disadvantages of inflexibility in meeting both amortization and other necessary operating costs. Without available fee revenue, the union is hard put to maintain reserves, to provide adequate staff, or to present even a minimum social program. In short, it may be unable to do the job for which the building was erected.

Financing Operation and Construction Through a Student Fee

A uniform union membership fee for students is the customary chief source of revenue of almost all college unions, not only to provide the coverage

for construction debt financing, where necessary, but also for operation. It is collected ordinarily by the college at registration time. The amount is adjusted from time to time as enrollment or the dollar value changes. In 1963 the median fee was approximately $10 per semester, but ranged as high as $60 per semester.

In only a few cases do *operating* funds come not from student fees but from one or a combination of the following sources: general college funds; endowment; profits from large bookstore or dining operations. In one case the college simply makes up the operating deficit at the end of the year. In another case the union is budgeted for by the college in the same manner as for an academic department.

The reasons for the widespread adoption of the uniform student fee (instead of a college appropriation for operation, or a voluntary fee) are:

1. The conception of most unions from the beginning has been that of a center and organization in which a student participates by virtue of being a member, for which membership he pays a moderate sum. Having paid the fee, he has a greater feeling of belonging. He interests himself in the operation and activities of the union. He uses the building more.

2. The union undertakes to give students the widest possible experience in self-government processes and training for citizenship. Part of that training consists in having students feel the responsibility of paying for the benefits which all may enjoy. As future citizens they will find taxes inescapable.

3. In practice, the union fee usually saves a student much more than it costs. The fee makes the union and its services possible. Indirectly this often controls the cost of meals in the entire college district (because of the standards and prices maintained by the union); directly it reduces greatly the cost of recreation.

4. A large proportion of the union building is non-income producing and must be maintained and serviced. The social and educational program must be provided for. The equipment which students wear out and use up must be paid for and replaced. To try to meet these necesssary expenses from the uncertain revenues of the business departments would make the prices of meals and other services prohibitive to students without producing sufficient revenue. To meet such expenses out of college appropriations would mean placing the union requirements in competition with other essential educational enterprises.

The union student fee is often petitioned for or voted by the student body. (California law requires a two-thirds favorable vote in a student referendum). The fee receipts are earmarked for union use only, and, in accord

with self-government practice, the union governing board representing the student "taxpayers" is given extensive jurisdiction over the use of fee receipts, especially for program purposes.

Reserves for Repairs and Replacements

At some colleges no provision is made for equipment repair and replacement reserves, which is a serious detriment to proper maintenance. The recommended practice is to set up an annual cash reserve of 8%-12% of the original cost of equipment and furnishings. If the bond or loan redemption provisions permit (which is desirable), accumulated cash in the reserve can be profitably invested in advance payments on indebtedness, with a considerable saving of interest charges.

Building repairs in many cases are made by the college out of general maintenance funds without charge to the union, usually because the college wants to minimize the student fee assessment and/or feels this is an appropriate way of offsetting the union's expenses of serving non-students (adult conferences, faculty, departmental meetings, etc.),

Preferred practice, however, is for the union to initiate and pay for building repairs. The appearance of the union vitally affects how much it is used and therefore its income. By paying for its own building repairs more complete and more frequent maintenance is provided than the general college maintenance budget can usually afford. Major work is usually done by the college physical plant department, sometimes by private contractors; minor repair work is frequently done by the union's maintenance employees.

A reserve for replacing the building is seldom established, the theory being that current users should not be asked to pay both for the existing building (as in the case of a large indebtedness) and a future building.

Utilities

Practice in payment for utilities (heat, water, gas, light and power) follows several patterns.

Most colleges pay all or part of the utility charges (in widely varying combinations) out of general funds as an offset (as in the case of building repairs) to the expenses incurred by the union in serving the college generally—expenses not related to the services and program for which students pay a union fee. College administrations in the main hold the view that the expenses of servicing conferences and institutes of off-campus groups, faculty affairs, and non-student offices in the union should not fall directly or indirectly upon the student fee.

Some colleges pay out of college funds the utility costs for just the non-revenue producing areas of the union. Revenue-producing departments of the union are charged.

Some expect the union to pay its entire utility cost out of union receipts. In such cases the non-student use of the union is sometimes paid for by the college through a book credit to the union.

Funds for Program

What it costs to present a suitable social-cultural program, or *should* cost, is one of the least explored areas of all areas of union operation. The principal guidelines to date are given in "Financing Programs," a paper presented in the 1962 Wisconsin Union Summer Course in College Union Operations, brief highlights of which follow:

"The mark of a union that believes in what it says about its purposes is a good social-cultural program for the campus, adequately financed.

"What is adequate financing?

"Here one has to start by distinguishing between (a) the costs of staff to guide the program, (b) the costs of custodial and clerical services that support the program, and (c) the direct out-of-pocket costs of the program itself.

"It is the last item—the direct out-of-pocket program costs—that is dealt with here: costs of supplies, printing, postage, lecture and dance band fees, rental of films and art shows, books for the library, records for the music room, refreshments for coffee hours, etc., etc.

"The distinction is important. The custodial and office services that make the program possible, the staff time that goes into guidance and supervision can easily run 10 times the out-of-pocket program costs—not to mention the *indirect* costs of utilities, repair and depreciation of building and equipment, and a share of the debt charges which *could* be attributed to programmed use of the building if you could find a sensible way to do it.

"A further distinction needs to be made. Out-of-pocket costs means costs *not* offset in whole or part by income from the program.

"With these distinctions firmly in mind, then the best evidence we have points to the cost of a reasonably adequate program being in the range of 75c to $2.25 per student per school year. The range is necessarily wide because obviously—with some costs fairly constant—when you have an enrollment of, say, 2,000 you will need to spend more on program per capita than when you have an enrollment of 12000. An orchestra for a free mixer, an art show, or a visiting lecturer costs about the same regardless of how many students are enrolled.

"The following is a suggested scale of expenditures per full time student for the out-of-pocket costs of programs presented without ticket charge:

Enrollment	Suggested Free Program Budget per Full Time Student*
Over 8000	$ .80
3000-8000	1.50
Under 3000	2.00

"Hence, if you have 2000 full time students, you would be shooting for a $4000 program budget; if 15,000 students, $12000. Funds for summer programs, now rapidly expanding, should be provided in addition.

"Where does the money come from?

"The typical sources are the union fee, direct college appropriation, allocation from a general student activities fee, earnings of building revenue-producing departments, net proceeds of revenue-producing programs, or a combination of the above.

"A major means of expanding regular program offerings, and often realizing net earnings that help pay for free activities, is the self-financing program.

"Some of the programs that are likely to finance themselves, and possibly produce net earnings, are dances; talent shows; concerts and plays with 'name' performers; some lectures; movies; travel lecture-films; outings; rentals of skis, bikes, boats; dance and bridge lessons; darkroom use.

"Some consider that not only can charges be made where the activity is popular and therefore likely to pay for itself readily, but also that where a program is, of its nature, limited to a few students, often repeaters, and they use for their personal benefit or pleasure rooms, supplies, services paid for by *all* students through the union fee, this limited group of students rightly should pay a 'use fee' to cover all or part of the cost. Hence, darkroom use fees, sailing club fees, charges for a series of bridge lessons. One Australian union even charges by the hour to use the music listening rooms, to pay the cost of records. Others find the popularity of a program increases if a charge is made. Often the student reaction is: 'If it's free, it must not be very worthwhile.'

---

* *These per capita expenditures were suggested in 1962. Because of steadily rising costs of supplies, printing, services, and fees—especially performers' fees—these figures should be increased, to provide equivalent programming in 1967, by 15-25%.*

"In any event, it's fairly clear that students have the money to pay for certain programs and will spend it if it's a good program, and that the program can expand significantly when charges are made."

Staff Benefits

In most cases all union employees (full time and student part time) are paid out of union receipts, though in one survey 9% of the unions responding reported their professional staffs were carried on the college payroll.

According to an intensive study of the position of the union director by James W. Lyons, directors of 247 unions received, in 1962, the following "fringe" benefits:

	Campus Enrollment		
Fringe Benefit	Under 5000	Over 5000	All Schools
Paid Vacation	87.9%	97.6%	91.1%
Group Medical Insurance	89.1	95.1	91.1
Sick Leave	88.5	95.1	90.7
Retirement	86.7	96.3	89.9
Travel Allowance to Professional Meetings	86.1	97.6	89.9
Social Security	85.5	85.4	85.4
Group Life Insurance	67.9	85.4	73.7
Bookstore Discounts	50.0	62.2	54.7
Full or Partial Waiver of Course Fees	52.1	51.2	51.8
Credit Union Privileges	32.1	65.9	43.3
Tenure	29.1	29.3	29.2
5 or More Free Meals per Week	22.4	35.4	26.7
Sabbatical Leave	20.6	18.3	19.8
Income Protection Insurance	20.0	17.1	19.0
Medical Care in College Infirmary at Lower-than-Usual Rates	20.0	15.9	18.6
College Owned Housing at Lower-than-Usual Rental	20.6	13.4	18.2
5 or more Meals per Week at Discount	3.6	9.8	5.7

Profit Objective

165 out of 190 unions in the 1963 Association survey reported that profit goals are variously set by the union staffs (25%), business office (11%), union and business office jointly (37%), union governing board (16%), college governing board (9%), and others (2%). Usually the aim is "to make expenses annually and allow for a margin of safety," or "serve students better than elsewhere in town at the same or slightly less cost, and at least break even."

Most colleges realize that what the union charges for meals and recreation (about one-half of a college student's expenses) substantially governs the level of prices elsewhere in the whole college community and therefore vitally affects the cost of going to college. The result is a conscious policy to hold down student costs, which in turn means slim union profit margins. In the case of the main revenue-producing department of a union—the dining service—the profit margin often aimed at as "safe" is 5%.

To accomplish its overall objectives it is important that the college so arrange the fundamental financing of the union—through an adequate student fee and other underwriting of non-revenue facilities—that the revenue departments will not be under constant pressure to make a high margin of profit to pay for other building operating costs.

Disposition of Operating Balances

Any surplus which does accumulate from union operations is used typically in one of the following ways:

1. Carried over to the next year as protection of current price levels when conditions are uncertain.

2. Carried over and utilized to reduce prices or to add services for students.

3. Invested in pre-payments on indebtedness, to save interest and establish a future margin of safety in operations.

4. Invested in needed new construction or equipment.

5. Transferred to a reserve fund for major repairs or a new addition.

The determination of the use of operating surpluses is variously made by the union staff (17%), business office (16%), union and business office jointly (37%), union policy board (13%), college governing board (11%), and others (6%).

ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE UNIONS —INTERNATIONAL

The Association was founded in 1914; it is one of the oldest intercollegiate educational organizations. Its purpose is to provide an opportunity for unions to join in studying and improving their services, and to assist in the development of new college unions.

The Association membership numbers approximately 750 colleges and universities, including junior colleges, in the United States, Canada, England, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines, Israel, Venezuela, and Puerto Rico. Included are many "Houses," "Halls," and "Centers" which serve as community centers for the campus, whether they be found at co-educational, men's, or women's colleges. It is not necessary to have a building to be an Association member.

Regional Representatives from 15 geographical areas of the United States and Canada assist in the general development of the Association, advise on matters of policy, and arrange for regional conferences in the fall which emphasize both student and staff participation.

An international conference is held annually for staff members.

A central headquarters, information service, and employment service are currently maintained (in 1967) at Willard Straight Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. (Office location to be changed July 1, 1968). Copies of all Association publications may be obtained from this office. Also on file are copies of surveys and studies made on many aspects of union operation.

The standing committees of the Association fos r studies and programs concerned with the arts, recreation, junior colleges, nternational relations, public relations, professional development, research, joint efforts with other educational associations, special projects, and relations with artists' representatives.

AN INVITATION TO MEMBERSHIP

Any campus agency which presents a general social-cultural-recreational program for the student body as a primary activity is cordially invited to become a member of the Association.

Membership is by unions (or by the college itself where there is no union organization). The membership fee is based on current full time student enrollment, according to a sliding scale, and is customarily paid by the college or the union organization. Colleges without a union building are eligible for Association Membership, at a lower rate.

Interested college or student officers may determine the applicable rate and arrange for membership at any time by writing the Association office at Willard Straight Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14850.